Remarks/Arguments

Claims 1,3,6-21,23 and 26-43 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 21 and 42 are independent.

Claims 1,3,6-21,23 and 26-43 were rejected.

Claims 3, 23 and 26-41 were objected to because of informalities.

Claims 3, 23, 26 and 39 are amended to rectify the informalities noted.

Claim 1 is amended to recite :

(i) a plug-in access handler; support for this amendment is provided at least at page 21, lines 1-4, and at page 20 lines 22-24 of the application as filed.

(ii) that the plug-in access handler is configured to be specific to the target application; support for this amendment is provided at least at page 12, lines 16-18 of the application as filed.

(iii) that the plug-in access handler is associated with the interface component; support for this amendment is provided at least at page 16, lines 28-29 and also at page 19, lines 16- 17 of the application as filed.

Claims 21, 42 and 43 are similarly amended.

No new matter has been added by way of these claim amendments.

Claim Rejections Under 35 USC 102

Claim 1 as amended recites: *A method for providing dynamic interaction between a pair of application programs by an interface module of a terminal, the pair of applications including a requestor application desiring access to a target application, the method comprising the steps of:*

registering access information of the target application, the access information including published access information made available in a data structure for retrieval by the interface module;

receiving an access request by the interface module from the requestor application, the access request including content corresponding to the published access information of the target application;

obtaining an interface component by using the content to search the data structure, the interface component including an application program interface (API) configured in a language incompatible with the interface module;- the ~~interface component further including~~

<u>identifying a plug-in access handler associated with the interface component, the plug-in access handler configured to be specific to the target application and</u> ~~access handler~~ *for translating the incompatible language between the API and the interface module; and*

employing the interface component by the interface module to satisfy the access request of the requestor application for interaction with the target application.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 6-7, 12-16, 18-21, 23, 26-27, 32-36 and 38-43 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Slaughter, US patent no.

7,458,082. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections in view of the claim amendments herein and the following remarks.

As described in the Background of the application as filed, one of the problems the subject invention addresses relates to communication between related applications. Typically, if an application interface changes, it is also required to change many, or all, of the related or dependent applications to maintain compatibility and interoperability.

Applicant respectfully submits that at least the claim 1 element of "…*identifying a plug-in access handler associated with the interface component, the plug-in access handler configured to be specific to the target application and for translating the incompatible language between the API and the interface module*" is not disclosed in Slaughter.

Slaughter describes use of a message passing model in a distributed computing environment to identify and share resources and applications while avoiding interoperability and configuration problems typical of existing networks.

In rejecting claim 1, the Examiner asserted the proxy 550 of Slaughter as disclosing the access handler. Applicant has amended claim 1 to recite appropriate structural limitations related to the access handler of claim 1, which enable the calling application to access any API, whether native or otherwise.

Therefore, for at least the reasons discussed above, Applicant submits claim 1 as amended herein is patentable in view of Slaughter and, as such, requests that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Independent claims 21, 42 and 43 include similar limitations as claim 1, and a corresponding argument applies. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the rejection to these claims be withdrawn for at least the same reasons discussed above with regard to the Slaughter reference.

Since the remaining dependent claims depend from one of the above noted independent claims, Applicant submits that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn for at least the same reasons, since none of the cited Slaughter, Loo or Bloch references disclose the claim element discussed above.

For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is patentable over the prior art. Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

/Henry Ohab/
Agent for the Applicant
Henry Ohab
Registration No. 45,854

Gowling Lafleur Henderson LLP
Suite 1600, 1 First Canadian Place
100 King Street West
Toronto, Ontario
Canada M5X 1G5